## **REMARKS**

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 4, 10 and 12 are amended, claims 3 and 13-14 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and new claim 15 is added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa (Patent Abstracts of Japan, "Associative Memory," Publication No. 2001-236790, published August 31, 2001) in view of Kanazawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/122337); rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and in further view of Pereira (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,793); rejects claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and in further view of Lyon (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,812); rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and in further view of Pereira and in even further view of Khanna (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,514); rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and in further view of Lyon and in even further view of Pereira and Khanna; rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of Kanazawa and Pereira; and

Specifically, Applicants assert that Yoshizawa, Kanazawa, Pereira, Lyon and Khanna fail to disclose or suggest, either individually or in combination, a CAM device wherein if the CAM device includes no physical bank assigned to the logical bank to be searched, the logical bank-physical bank converter outputs a signal to the cascade circuit to inform that

there is no physical bank assigned to the logical bank so that the cascade circuit generates one of a signal indicating that there is no hit entry in the CAM device and a signal indicating that there is no empty entry in the CAM device as a search result of the CAM device, as recited in independent claim 2.

In stark contrast, Kanazawa, in Fig. 5 and paragraphs [0080] - [0081], merely discloses a CAM device including a step of when there is a defective CAM word, the signal "OROUT<sub>I+1</sub>" is outputted from a selector 46 which corresponds to the CAM word located at the one word lower order address, as the signal PRl<sub>i</sub>. Kanazawa, however, fails to disclose that the logical bank-physical bank converter outputs a signal to the cascade circuit to inform that there is no physical bank assigned to the logical bank, as recited in independent claim 2.

Yoshizawa, Pereira, Lyon and Khanna also fail to disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, even if Kanazawa were combined with the other applied references in the manner suggested by the Office Action, the combination of features recited in claim 2 would not be achieved.

According to the above remarks, Applicants submit that independent claim 2 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 15 depend from independent claim 2, and therefore, also define patentable subject matter, as well as for the additional features they recite. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 15 are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/790,058

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Tiffany J. Brooks

Registration No. 57,912

JAO:TJB/rle

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: April 11, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928 Alexandria, Virginia 22320 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461